

RECEIVED

JUN 20 2018

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
FIFTH DISTRICT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

NEELAM UPPAL

APPELLANT/DEFENDANT,

vs.

Case No. 5D17-3401

L.T. No. 13-3790-CA

HEALTHLAW FIRM, et al

APPELLEE/PLAINTIFF

NOTICE TO INVOKE DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION

NOTICE IS GIVEN that Appellant Neelam Uppal, pro se pursuant to

Exhibit 3

RECEIVED, 06/20/2018 09:13:25 AM, Clerk, Supreme Court

Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.030(a)(2)(A)(iii) and (iv) and 9.120(b) and (c), as well as Article V, section 3(b)(3) of the Florida Constitution, hereby invokes the discretionary jurisdiction of the Florida Supreme Court to review the decision of the District Court issued on May 22, 2018, and the Circuit Court's Order rendered on September 22, 2017 and December 22, 2015 ordering payment of Fraudulent attorney bills.

The nature of the decision on review is a decision of a district court of appeal that (a) expressly affects the citizens of Florida Attorney fees fraud and Equity Theft. The court acted in lack of jurisdiction . There is infringement of the Constitutional rights of the appellant by denying her due process by acts of Fraud in Court and Conspiracy that directly conflicts with a decision of another district court of appeal or of the Florida Supreme Court on the same question of law.

Statement of Issue

WHETHER THE COURT SHOULD ACCEPT DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION IN THIS CASE

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The Appellant/Defendant below, Neelam Uppal, will be referred to as

"Appellant" or Defendant in this brief. Appellee/Plaintiff below, Wells Fargo

Bank, will be referred to as the "Plaintiff" or "Appellee."

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

**WHETHER THE COURT SHOULD ACCEPT DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION IN THIS
CASE**

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

This Court should agree to accept discretionary jurisdiction over the instant case because there is a direct conflict between the Fifth District Court of Appeal and the First District Court of Appeal, and it is likely that the underlying issue regarding lower court judges entering judgments without Jurisdiction will recur again.

ARGUMENT ISSUE:

**WHETHER THE COURT SHOULD ACCEPT DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION IN THIS
CASE**

Defendant contends that this Court should exercise its discretion to review the
appellate decision because the “the district court cannot ignore Florida Statutes
or

be reconciled with the previous decision of this Court in Gibson v. Progress Bank

of Florida, 2D10-4137 (Fla. 2nd DCA, Feb. 23, 2011) and

1. Defendant holds that The attorney and the Judges are in violation of U.S.C. 15
sec.1650 for deceptive and unfair practices
2. The 5th DCA is in violation of

812.014□Theft.—

(1)□A person commits theft if he or she knowingly obtains or uses, or endeavors to obtain
or to use, the property of another with intent to, either temporarily or permanently:

(a)□Deprive the other person of a right to the property or a benefit from the property.

3.The district is in violation of Federal trade Commission Act, section 5 for
deceptive and unfair lending practices

Defendant repeats all the above laws and further states:

1. The Plaintiff is in violation of Fair debt Collection Practices act of 15 U.S.C. Sec.
1692 (C) (c), 1692(f), 1692(g), 1692(h), 1692(l), 1692(j)

2. The Appellant requests that this Court invoke jurisdiction of this case as to the discretionary jurisdiction filed pursuant to Art. V, § 3(b)(3), Florida Constitution (i.e., expressly declares valid a state statute and expressly construes a provision of the state or federal constitution).

3. Florida Statutes 733.11 F.S. 817.234(3) (3) applies to Final Judgement.

4. The Florida Constitution, in which it has empowered the Appellate Courts, is to make key judgments regarding the implementation of the law is undermined, The Appellant is deprived of her right under the Constitution of Florida Art. V section 4 (b) (1).

5. The Lower court does not have Jurisdiction under Florida rules of Appellate procedure 9. 600 (a) and (b), and 18 USC 1334 (a) and (e)

The lower court rendered decision while it did not have jurisdiction.

6. As a result, this Honorable Court should exercise its discretionary jurisdiction

pursuant to Fla. R. App. P. 9.310(f) to entertain this case, it states " Additionally,

Fla. R. of Civil P. 1.560, this provides another basis for this this court to invoke

Jurisdiction.

1. The Defendant requests that this Court invoke jurisdiction of this case as to the discretionary jurisdiction filed pursuant to Art. V, § 3(b)(3), Florida Constitution i(i.e., expressly declares valid a state statute and expressly construes a provision of the state or federal constitution).
2. Wherefore, I request this court to declare all orders of the Circuit court of sixth Judicial null and void.

Respectfully submitted,

NEELAM UPPAL, PRO, SE

P.O BOX 1002.

LARGO, FL-33779

PH. - (727)-403-0022

E-mail- nneelu123@aol.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT a true copy of the foregoing was furnished by U.S. Mail to Healthlaw firm, 11 Douglas, Altamonte springs, Florida 32714, this _21st day of June, 2018

\S\Neelam Uppal

NEELAM UPPAL, PRO SE

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT the instant pleading was produced in Times New Roman
14-point font of 824 words

\S\Neelam Uppal

NEELAM UPPAL, PRO SE

Paula Alexander

From: eFile5DCA@flcourts.org
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 1:32 PM
To: George F. Indest; CourtFilings
Subject: CaseMail: A Document(Notice of Discretn, Jurisdictn) has been filed in case: 17-3401
(Category: Other)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

DCA Case No: 17-3401
Case Name : NEELAM UPPAL v HEALTH LAW FIRM
LT Case No : 13-3790-CA

A document has been filed in the above referenced case. You may use the link below to view the document or you can log on eDCA to access the document.

<https://edca.5dca.org/eNotice.aspx?id=66151-4809-1306949-4999>

Please DO NOT respond to this email. It was sent from an unattended mailbox.

